

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  
AMERICA, INC.,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00103-JRG-RSP

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the remaining portion of Samsung’s Motion to Supplement Expert Reports. **Dkt. No. 241.** On November 20, 2024, the Court granted the part of Samsung’s Motion regarding rebuttal to Headwater’s supplemental expert report. Dkt. No. 245. The Court also deferred ruling on the part of the motion related to supplementing Samsung’s expert reports in response to Headwater’s expert disclosing a “new” claim construction opinion in a deposition. *Id.* In that Order, the Court directed Headwater to respond to the remaining portion. *Id.* Headwater has now filed its opposition. Dkt. No. 284.

The Court does not find that Samsung has shown good cause to supplement. Both parties’ experts are bound to the opinions expressed in their timely disclosed reports. If Samsung believes that Mr. de la Iglesia goes beyond his, then they may object at trial. Accordingly, the remaining portion of the Motion is denied.

It is **ORDERED** that Samsung does not have leave to supplement the expert reports of Drs. Foster and Perryman in response to Mr. de la Iglesia's deposition.

**SIGNED this 27th day of November, 2024.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROY S. PAYNE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE